

## **Program B: Quality Educators**

Program Authorization: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; as amended by P.L. 103-382, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994; [Teacher Payments] Program Authorization: R.S. 17:3601-3661; 17:21-22; 36:649; Program Authorization: R.S. 36:649 (e)

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The Quality Educators Subgrantee Program encompasses PIP, Professional Leadership Development, Tuition Assistance, and Class Size Reduction activities that are designed to assist local education agencies (LEAs) to improve schools and to improve teacher and administrator quality. Activities include PIP, Professional Development/Leadership/Innovative, Education Personnel Tuition Assistance, and Class Size Reduction.

The mission of the Quality Educators Subgrantee Program is to provide resources, services and assistance to LEAs, teachers, and administrators to improve teacher and administrator quality for the purpose of school improvement and increased student achievement.

The goals of this program are:

1. To insure that program participants are paid correctly and in a timely manner.
2. To flow funds to locals to improve the knowledge and skills of school personnel.
3. To flow funds to locals to increase the percentage of teachers participating in Vocational Technology IE certification program.
4. To flow funds to locals to reduce K-3 grade class sizes to 18 or fewer students by hiring more teachers.

### **OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are accomplished during FY 2001-2002. Performance indicators have two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values shown are for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

1. (KEY) Through the Professional Improvement Program (PIP) activity, to monitor local school systems to assure that 100% of PIP funds are paid correctly and that participants are funded according to guidelines.

Strategic Link: Strategy I.1.2: *To monitor local school systems to assure that 100% of PIP funds are paid correctly and that participants are funded according to guidelines.*

Louisiana: Vision 2020 Link: Agency states that there is no link to Vision 2020.

Children's Cabinet Link: The DOE budget and the Children's Cabinet budget are essentially identical. Where there are funds, programs and activities in the plan, there are corresponding funds, programs and activities in the Children's Cabinet budget.

Other Link(s): Not applicable

L E V E L	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1999-2000	ACT 11 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002
K	Total PIP annual program costs (salary and retirement)	\$30,262,831 <sup>1</sup>	\$30,107,618	\$27,154,250	\$27,154,250	\$24,354,250 <sup>2</sup>	\$24,354,250
K	PIP average salary increment	\$1,786 <sup>3</sup>	\$1,773	\$1,706	\$1,706	\$1,676 <sup>4</sup>	\$1,676
K	Number of remaining PIP participants <sup>5</sup>	15,143 <sup>6</sup>	15,146	14,200	14,200	13,100 <sup>7</sup>	13,100

<sup>1</sup> The performance standard was adjusted from \$30,262,831 beginning FY 99-00 and was revised to \$30,128,415.

<sup>2</sup> Agency notes this is a tentative executive budget recommendation for FY 2001-2002.

<sup>3</sup> The performance standard was adjusted from \$1761 beginning FY 99-00 and was revised to \$1786.

<sup>4</sup> Agency notes this is a tentative executive budget recommendation for FY 2001-2002.

<sup>5</sup> The fluctuation in participants is due to over-estimating the number of teachers who will opt to retire in a given year and for the comparison of actual enrollment. Also, more retirees are being rehired that once received PIP and this offsets the expected decrease.

<sup>6</sup> The performance standard was adjusted from 14,751 beginning FY 99-00 and was revised to 15,143.

<sup>7</sup> Agency notes this is a tentative executive budget recommendation for FY 2001-2002.

- 2.(KEY) Through the Professional Development/Leadership/Innovative activity, to have at least 60% of the 74 districts provide professional development at a sustained, intensive, high quality level that has a lasting impact on classroom instruction.

Strategic Link: Strategy I.1.1: *Title II Eisenhower Professional Development program will have 74 active local teacher training programs with 100% effective ratings.*

Louisiana: *Vision 2020* Link: Agency states that there is no link to Vision 2020.

Children's Cabinet Link: The DOE budget and the Children's Cabinet budget are essentially identical. Where there are funds, programs and activities in the plan, there are corresponding funds, programs and activities in the Children's Cabinet budget.

Other Link(s): Not applicable

L E V E L	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1999-2000	ACT 11 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002
K	Percentage of districts providing professional development with Title II funds	40%	Not applicable	50%	50%	75%	85%
K	Percentage of teachers provided professional development with Title II funds <sup>1</sup>	40%	Not applicable	50%	50%	75%	85%
K	Percentage of districts providing professional development with 8(g) funds	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	Not applicable	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	60%	60%
K	Percentage of teachers provided professional development with 8(g) funds	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	Not applicable	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	Not applicable <sup>2</sup>	60%	60%

<sup>1</sup> This indicator is objective 3, indicator 3.1 of the U.S. Dept. of Education Strategic Plan.

<sup>2</sup> This performance indicator did not appear under Act 10 of 1999 or Act 11 of 2000; therefore it has no performance standard for FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001.

3. (KEY) Through the Professional Development/Innovative activity, to have 74 active local reform/school improvement programs that provide funds for innovative programs that support state reforms.

Strategic Link: Strategy I.1.1: *Title II Eisenhower Professional Development programs will have 74 active local teacher training programs with 100% effectiveness rating.*

Louisiana: *Vision 2020* Link: Agency states that there is no link to Vision 2020.

Children's Cabinet Link: The DOE budget and the Children's Cabinet budget are essentially identical. Where there are funds, programs and activities in the plan, there are corresponding funds, programs and activities in the Children's Cabinet budget.

Other Link(s): Not applicable

Explanatory Note: Title II programs are designed and conducted by the local schools and LEAs. The range of activities varies greatly, and the individual program evaluations are retained by the local education agencies.

L E V E L	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1999-2000	ACT 11 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002
K	Number of innovative programs funded to support state and local school improvement programs	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	62	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	74 <sup>2</sup>	74	74
K	Public/Nonpublic students participating	125,202	1,195,459 <sup>3</sup>	138,000	138,000	138,000	138,000

<sup>1</sup> This performance indicator did not appear under Act 10 of 1999 or Act 11 of 2000; therefore it has no performance standard for FY 1999-2000 and FY 2000-2001.

<sup>2</sup> This is an estimate.

<sup>3</sup> The Department of Education notes in LAPAS, "The education reform initiative has had a positive impact on more students than initially expected. This data is submitted by LEAs on the total number of public/nonpublic students impacted by Innovative Education Programs."

4. (KEY) Through the Professional Development/Teacher Tuition Exemption activity, to make professional development opportunities available to as many teachers or potential teachers as funding allows.

Strategic Link: Strategy I.1.3: *To increase the percent of teachers participating in the Vocational Technical Industrial Educational certification program.*

Louisiana: Vision 2020 Link: Agency states that there is no link to Vision 2020.

Children's Cabinet Link: The DOE budget and the Children's Cabinet budget are essentially identical. Where there are funds, programs and activities in the plan, there are corresponding funds, programs and activities in the Children's Cabinet budget.

Other Link(s): Not applicable

Explanatory Note: 'Explanatory Note: The Innovative Professional Development Program was restructured and funds were combined with Louisiana LEARN. Public school systems submit a single application for LEARN and 8(g) innovative programs. The budgets are separate, however, the innovative program may pay partial salaries, related benefits, supplies, etc. School systems are required to hire an Instructional Facilitator to work with no more than 4 schools. Agencies no longer identify the number of teachers or other staff members that are served. The IPD no longer funds credit and non-credit courses except in nonpublic schools/systems. Independent non public schools have been added as eligible agencies for FY 2000-01.

L E V E L	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1999-2000	ACT 11 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002
K	Number of scholarships/stipends for prospective teachers: approved applications for certified and non-certified teachers out-of-field	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	1,423	1,136	1,136	1,200	1,200
K	Number of Tuition exemption basic: approved applications of certified teachers in content or content methodology	2,641 <sup>2</sup>	4,607	3,876	3,876	3,876	4,000

<sup>1</sup> This performance indicator did not appear under Act 10 of 1999; therefore it has no performance standard for FY 1999-2000.

<sup>2</sup> Although the performance standard is 2,641, the agency estimates a better number to be 3,876. This program now serves certified teachers who are teaching within their area of certification. Participants in this program may pursue courses in content or content methodology.

5. (KEY) Through the Class Size Reduction (CRS) Grant activity, to hire and retain 909 additional teachers, and to reduce class size in selected targeted grade(s) 1-3 to 18 or fewer students.

Strategic Link: The Subgrantee Assistance Quality Educators (formally called Professional Development in the strategic plan) strategy does not contain reference to the new activity "Class Size Reduction/Federal".

Louisiana: Vision 2020 Link: Agency states that there is no link to Vision 2020.

Children's Cabinet Link: The DOE budget and the Children's Cabinet budget are essentially identical. Where there are funds, programs and activities in the plan, there are corresponding funds, programs and activities in the Children's Cabinet budget.

Other Link(s): Not applicable

L E V E L	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1999-2000	ACT 11 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 2000-2001	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2001-2002
K	Additional teachers hired	700	714	400 <sup>1</sup>	400	725	909
K	Percentage of participating schools reducing class size to 18 or below in their selected, targeted grade(s) K -3	50%	63%	50%	50%	63%	63%

<sup>1</sup> As the number of teachers needed to reduce class size to 18 or below decreases, the LEAs may use up to 15% of the remaining allocated funds for professional development activities. As more districts achieve an 18 to 1 ratio, additional teachers are not necessary.

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR THE PROGRAM

	ACTUAL 1999 - 2000	ACT 11 2000 - 2001	EXISTING 2000 - 2001	CONTINUATION 2001 - 2002	RECOMMENDED 2001 - 2002	RECOMMENDED OVER/(UNDER) EXISTING
MEANS OF FINANCING:						
STATE GENERAL FUND (Direct)	\$32,045,602	\$28,271,446	\$28,271,446	\$25,601,446	\$25,601,446	(\$2,670,000)
STATE GENERAL FUND BY:						
Interagency Transfers	2,873,546	3,924,992	3,924,992	3,924,992	4,534,992	610,000
Fees & Self-gen. Revenues	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statutory Dedications	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interim Emergency Board	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	35,643,279	51,970,460	51,970,460	51,970,460	57,002,993	5,032,533
TOTAL MEANS OF FINANCING	<u><u>\$70,562,427</u></u>	<u><u>\$84,166,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$84,166,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$81,496,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$87,139,431</u></u>	<u><u>\$2,972,533</u></u>
EXPENDITURES & REQUEST:						
Salaries	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Related Benefits	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Operating Expenses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Other Charges	70,562,427	84,166,898	84,166,898	81,496,898	87,139,431	2,972,533
Total Acq. & Major Repairs	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST	<u><u>\$70,562,427</u></u>	<u><u>\$84,166,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$84,166,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$81,496,898</u></u>	<u><u>\$87,139,431</u></u>	<u><u>\$2,972,533</u></u>
AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME						
EQUIVALENTS: Classified	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unclassified	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>	<u><u>0</u></u>

## SOURCE OF FUNDING

This program is funded with General Fund, Interagency Transfers and Federal Funds. The Interagency Transfers include 8(g) allocated by the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. The sources of Federal Funds are as follows: Title 2 – Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program (P.L. 103-382 Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994); Title 6 – Innovative Program Strategies, as authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, amended by Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994; and, the Federal Class-Size Reduction Grant.

## ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATION

GENERAL FUND	TOTAL	T.O.	DESCRIPTION
<b>\$28,271,446</b>	<b>\$84,166,898</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>ACT 11 FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001</b>
			<b>BA-7 TRANSACTIONS:</b>
\$0	\$0	0	None
<b>\$28,271,446</b>	<b>\$84,166,898</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>EXISTING OPERATING BUDGET – December 15, 2000</b>
\$130,000	\$130,000	0	Teacher Certification Stipends
(\$2,800,000)	(\$2,800,000)	0	PIP Normal Attrition
\$0	\$610,000	0	Transfer INCLASS flowthrough from State Activities
\$0	\$5,032,533	0	Transfer from School Accountability & Improvement for decrease in Goals 2000 and increase in Title II
<b>\$25,601,446</b>	<b>\$87,139,431</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED</b>
<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>LESS GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>\$25,601,446</b>	<b>\$87,139,431</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>BASE EXECUTIVE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002</b>
			<b>SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE:</b>
\$0	\$0	0	None
<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE</b>
<b>\$25,601,446</b>	<b>\$87,139,431</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL RECOMMENDED</b>

The total means of financing for this program is recommended at 103.5% of the existing operating budget. It represents 96.8% of the total request (\$90,016,898) for this program. The increase in this program is a result of a reduction in the Professional Improvement Program for normal attrition; an additional \$130,000 dedicated to teacher certification stipends; the transfer of the INCLASS flow thru from State Activities; and, in increase in federal funds for Title II.



## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

\$0 This program does not have funding for Professional Services for Fiscal Year 2001-2002.

**\$0 TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**

## OTHER CHARGES

\$12,211,140	Title 2 - Flow-through to local education agencies
\$7,969,134	Title 6 - Flow through to local education agencies; formula-driven federal fund allocation to local school districts and lab schools
\$36,798,220	Class-Size Reduction: To help schools improve student achievement by adding additional, highly qualified teachers into the workforce and to reduce class size; particularly in the early grades (1-3) to no more than 18 children per class
\$23,917,724	Professional Improvement Program (PIP) payments to local school districts
\$100,000	Paraprofessionals: State general fund for tuition reimbursement of currently employed paraprofessionals seeking teaching certification
\$300,000	Teach for America
\$210,000	National Teacher Certification Stipends
\$637,196	Professional Accountability: Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program
\$238,706	Principal Internship
\$771,807	Scholarships/Stipends Prospective Teachers
\$1,718,498	Innovative Professional Development
\$1,195,981	Tuition Exemption - Basic 8(g): Tuition exemption for educators to obtain college course work related to areas of concentration by BESE or classes directly related to their fields of instruction
\$610,000	INCLASS flowthrough

**\$86,678,406 SUB-TOTAL OTHER CHARGES**

### Interagency Transfers:

\$11,269	Title 2 - Federal fund allocation to various state agencies
\$13,230	Title 6 - Federal fund allocation to various state agencies
\$436,526	Professional Improvement Program (PIP) payments to special schools, Department of Education and Southern University Lab Schools

**\$461,025 SUB-TOTAL INTERAGENCY TRANSFERS**

**\$87,139,431    TOTAL OTHER CHARGES**

## **ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS**

\$0    This program does not have funding for Acquisitions and Major Repairs for Fiscal Year 2001 -2002.

**\$0    TOTAL ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS**